

I am outraged by Sinclair's purely political attack on John Kerry so close to the election. This is not being done in the public interest. Their corporate position that they are giving voice to Vietnam veterans is an cynical example of pandering while continuing to put forth the lie that John Kerry was testifying as a single voice before Congress, He was relating information and stories he heard from other veterans who wanted to be heard. Why is it that these anonymous veterans that Sinclair is "helping" have more standing than other veterans except that it furthers the political and financial interests of a corporation that is supposed to serve the whole public, not just the public they like.

Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.